

From wang!elf.wang.com!ucsd.edu!packet-radio-relay Sat Feb 9 14:20:00 1991 remote  
from tosspot  
Received: by tosspot (1.63/waf)  
via UUCP; Sun, 10 Feb 91 21:00:01 EST  
for lee  
Received: from somewhere by elf.wang.com id aa28428; Sat, 9 Feb 91 14:19:59 GMT  
Received: from ucsd.edu by uunet.uu.net (5.61/1.14) with SMTP  
id AA06270; Sat, 9 Feb 91 08:24:51 -0500  
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA12277  
sendmail 5.64/UCSD-2.1-sun  
Sat, 9 Feb 91 04:30:19 -0800 for hpbbrd!db0sao!dg4scv  
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA12272  
sendmail 5.64/UCSD-2.1-sun  
Sat, 9 Feb 91 04:30:16 -0800 for /usr/lib/sendmail -oc -odb -oQ/var/spool/  
lqueue -oi -fpacket-radio-relay packet-radio-list  
Message-Id: <9102091230.AA12272@ucsd.edu>  
Date: Sat, 9 Feb 91 04:30:12 PST  
From: Packet-Radio Mailing List and Newsgroup </dev/null@ucsd.edu>  
Reply-To: Packet-Radio@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Packet-Radio Digest V91 #38  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Packet-Radio Digest                      Sat, 9 Feb 91                      Volume 91 : Issue 38

Today's Topics:

Has Part 97 changed THAT much? (was Re: PACKET->Internet Gateway)  
PACKET->Internet Gateway  
Tandy 100/102 series and packet radio - need hints

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Packet-Radio-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Packet-Radio Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/packet-radio".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 7 Feb 91 21:07:08 GMT  
From: hpl-opus!hpnmdla!alanb@hplabs.hpl.hp.com (Alan Bloom)  
Subject: Has Part 97 changed THAT much? (was Re: PACKET->Internet Gateway)  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In rec.ham-radio.packet, dana@locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

> [remainder deleted]

> My copy of Part 97 is in the ARRL "The FCC Rule Book". None of these  
> paragraphs (a) exist or (b) say the same thing. Has Part 97 really changed  
> that much since November 1, 1987?

Yes. There was a complete rewrite a couple years ago.

AL N1AL

-----  
Date: 5 Feb 91 19:18:26 GMT  
From: hsdndev!think.com!news!bruce@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Bruce Walker)  
Subject: PACKET->Internet Gateway  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <11771@helios.TAMU.EDU> willis@photon.tamu.EDU (Willis Marti) writes:

...  
For all except SMTP, it is easy to configure a router so that no one on the  
Internet side can initiate a connection. I then claim that since an  
amateur would be initiating the host session and/or file transfer, that  
passing traffic back and forth thru the router is within the rules.

Careful. While it is quite possible to configure a router so that no one  
can successfully initiate a connection to some or all TCP ports  
(services), it isn't generally possible to configure a router to not  
forward packets which look like part of an established connection but might  
not be. Such bogons would be discarded at their final destination, but if  
they had already crossed the airwaves, the damage would have been done.

--  
--Bruce Walker  
Thinking Machines Corporation, Cambridge, MA  
bruce@think.com; +1 617 234 4810

-----  
Date: 8 Feb 91 03:21:35 GMT  
From: uhccux!munnari.oz.au!manuel!csc.canberra.edu.au!echo!skcm@ames.arc.nasa.gov  
(Carl Makin)  
Subject: Tandy 100/102 series and packet radio - need hints  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In <1991Feb7.060014.11255@terminator.cc.umich.edu> swood@terminator.cc.umich.edu

(Scott Wood) writes:

>I am looking for help, and input from anyone that has used the tandy  
>100/102 laptops with their amateur radio set-ups. Especially with  
>packet or station management.

A tandy 100 was used in the first mobile and portable packet experiments here in Canberra. :-) Friend of mine had it setup in the car. Somebody connected to say hello and was rather confused when Doug typed back "not now I'm driving". :-)

We use that same m100 quite a bit when we go to a remote digipeater site as the terminal end of a TNC-2/HH portable station configuration.

There is also a BBS available for the m100 written in basic that seems to work ok over packet however with the growing number of PMSs it's not really worthwhile. Most TNC's now have more processing power than a m100.

Carl.

-----

End of Packet-Radio Digest

\*\*\*\*\*